

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OCTOBER 2, 1997**

PROJECTS REVIEWED

Convened: 8:00 AM

Aquarium Sound to Mountains Exhibit
Terminal 18
Washington State Convention and Trade Center Expansion
Princeton Bridge
Seattle Center Broad Street Improvements
Weller Street Bridge

Adjourned: 4:15 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Barbara Swift, Chair
Moe Batra
Carolyn Darwish
Gail Dubrow
Robert Foley
Gerald Hansmire
Jon Layzer
Rick Sundberg

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner
Peter Aylsworth
Rebecca Walls

100297.1 Project: **AQUARIUM SOUND TO MOUNTAINS EXHIBIT**
 Phase: Design Development
 Presenters: Tim Motzer, Department of Parks and Recreation
 Chip Reay, HOK Design
 Sally Nikoliyevich, HOK Design
 Time: 1 hr. (0.3%)

The new “Sound to Mountains” Exhibit replaces the existing exhibit south of the last marine mammal tank. The four fundamental themes of this project, as given by Tim Motzer, are the physical aspects and functionality of the Watershed, the natural and man-made changes and impacts to the Watershed, the cultural aspects of the Watershed, and how we can become better stewards of the Watershed.

The exhibit focuses on the salmon as the marker of watershed life. The organizing feature of the exhibit is the journey of the salmon and the impacts of agriculture, dams, lumbering, and industry on the progression of salmon from the sound to the mountains. The exhibit will be divided into three major segments, the upper river, the middle river, and the lower river. The exhibit is based on a live stream with a series of wall-mounted displays leading to the climactic waterfall/forest scene at the end. The design team anticipates using as much sensory technology as the budget will allow to ensure an exciting exhibit. The experience is enhanced by pools of ambient sounds of the natural setting, supplemented by voices of people, such as biologists, lumbermen, and others who have an effect on the salmon environment. These pools of sound are created by parabolic speaker systems located throughout the exhibit. The roar of the falls will get progressively louder as the mountain region is approached. The entry area has a marsh or estuary with a learning lab. The primary stream begins as a riverlet cascading down some existing stairs modified to look like stones. Across from the stream a living green wall will show the impacts that man has had on the watershed. The stream wraps around the existing mammal tank toward the falls and Cascade area. The falls will be separated into an upper pool and a lower pool with living animals and two foot change in the water level. There will be live trees and basalt stone replicating the forest environment. Natural lighting will come from behind the falls. A black oak handrail will have interpretive explanations and will provide a constant visual band connecting the entire exhibit. There will be a hierarchy of presentation throughout the project with bold, strong titles, smaller informative print, and finer print for more detailed information. This ensures that the more important information can be seen easily. At the end of the exhibit will be an area devoted to “What can I do” information.

* Image available in the Seattle Design Commission office.

Discussion:

Batra: Will the sound be natural or amplified?

Reay: Some of it will be natural, but most will be projected through amplifiers. They will be parabolic shaped amplifiers, creating pools of sound about 30" in diameter. These showers of sound won't mix together and become muddled.

Dubrow: Are the falls accessible from all sides?

Reay: One can only walk next to the falls, not around it.

Dubrow: Could the falls be explored, experienced from multiple sides?

Reay: We have looked at that possibility, but are limited by program space needs and ADA accessibility issues. The space behind the falls is needed for mechanical space. We also looked at using water at the floor level with bridges over it, but again it wasn't feasible.

Dubrow: In the Human Impact section there seems to be little representation of industry's impact on watersheds. Is there room for non-profit organizations to display at the end of the exhibit, in the "What can I do" space? It could become a avenue for people to actively get involved.

Layzer: Also, I think that the panel on "urbanization" needs to cover the broader issue of "suburbanization." It would be a shame to reinforce the false sense of density and downtown as the source of all urban evils.

Swift: Is the green wall painted or plant material?

Reay: It will be living plant material.

Swift: You have an interesting challenge. The people of this region typically are sophisticated in their knowledge and understanding of the region's eco-systems. The Woodland Park Zoo sets the level of standards for the representation of eco-systems. Attention to eco-system sequence, transitions and forms is important. The cascade part of this exhibit, the form and choice of stone, will demand complete authenticity. Due to the sophisticated audience this exhibit will require absolute accuracy to be successful.

Foley: I like the continuity, progression, and strong termination of the exhibit. The sensory experience is also good, building to a climax at the end, where the space expands and the exhibit truly comes to life with the otter, which are a joy to watch. However, I question the prevalence of otters in the upper cascades and wonder if they are an appropriate animal selection for that area.

Batra: Given the world-wide problem with watersheds and the amount of international visitors here, perhaps this exhibit should include some material in foreign languages.

Reay: That is an important issue but would be difficult given the tight budget we have. Visitors could use the computer links on the Internet to cross the language barriers at the exhibit.

Dubrow: Multilingual information could be used by non-profit groups at the end of the exhibit in the "What can I do" space.

Sundberg: This exhibit works well even without words.

Hansmire: The complexity is impressive. It will be a wonderful experience.

Darwish: Are there opportunities for seating, rest stops along the way?

Reay: Given the hall-like nature of the space, there isn't room to allow people places to sit and relax. Some places are only six feet wide. At the upper river there could be rock ledges for leaning or sitting, but there is no room for benches.

Swift: That is an interesting point. Allowing people to stop enough to reflect and absorb the information is an important way to learn. The exhibit might need opportunities for visitors to slow down and enjoy the experience.

Dubrow: That could be achieved with little nooks or crannies pushed into the exhibit.

Swift: Leaning rails might also be sufficient.

Reay: There will be rock ledges along the stream for holding up children or leaning. We'll look into other leaning spots and possibilities.

Wagoner: Places for small children to view the exhibit are very important.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the project as presented.**

100297.2	Project: TERMINAL 18
	Phase: Schematics
	Presenters: George Blomberg, Port of Seattle Michael Burke, Port of Seattle
	Attendee: Berverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation
	Time: 1hr. (0.3%)

The Harbor Island expansion of Terminal 18 will be similar to the new Terminal 5. The Port of Seattle in conjunction with SSA hopes to issue bonds in April 1998 and begin construction in May 1998. Traffic and parking, along with the preservation of businesses, are the Port's major concerns. They propose to vacate 29 acres of public right-of-way that is currently 200 ft. wide and occupied by rail cars. The proposal provides a realignment of the entrances to Harbor Island at the Spokane St. corridor. The main improvements include vehicular access using a ramp segment over the new railroad tracks, and an ADA accessible pedestrian bridge over the tracks connecting the parking areas with Todd Shipyards Corporation. The vehicular access ramp will be of stabilized earth with clear spans over the tracks. The pedestrian bridge is required to be ADA accessible and therefore necessitates an elaborate system of ramps to reach the needed height. The intent is to have minimal visual and vehicular impedance to the largely industrial area. The Port is creating a public shoreline park space, about 1.3 acres and approximately 400 ft. long, on the west waterway. There are also landscape and access improvements proposed for the Spokane St. area. The Port was asked to explain the reasons behind the proposed pedestrian bridge and the need for parking within the railroad track loop.

Discussion:

- Layzer:** The surface parking needed is about seven to ten acres?
- Dubrow:** Could part of the former Lockhead site be used for parking outside the rail loop?
- Burke:** The Lockhead site cost the Port seven million dollars. There would be no revenue generated from providing parking. TODD is not interested in employee parking so far away.
- Sundberg:** The public is subsidizing TODD with free parking.
- Burke:** The Port is attempting to maximize island usage with this proposal. We are trying to utilize all the little crannies in the public ROW for parking. Over half of the off-site parking for TODD would be inside the loop of the new rail lines. The Port has recognized a need for 1100 spaces in the draft EIS. TODD wants more, approximately 2,000 total. TODD is getting subsidized parking while not in compliance with the Trip Reduction Act. This proposal has been an outcome of meeting with TODD's labor and management divisions.
- Darwish:** Have you considered a METRO stop in the island?
- Burke:** There is a METRO stop and turnaround in front of TODD shipyards. TODD, with trip reduction, could get by with 1,100 spaces.
- Dubrow:** If you want to encourage trip reduction, put half of the spaces close to TODD and half of the spaces farther away. The public has no obligation to provide TODD with parking. The public interest is in providing incentives for TODD to use a trip reduction plan.⁸
- Swift:** Did TODD substantiate a need for 2,000 spaces in their request? The amount of unused land in the Duwamish area is approximately 10% and getting smaller. Given this lack of available land in the Duwamish area, perhaps it's time for TODD to make real efforts to consolidate their parking.
- Layzer:** The 200 foot ROWs were probably established on Harbor Island to support the boom and bust cycles of the industry. The parking spaces south of the rail do create some inconvenience problems. Parking information could be provided at the south end of the island. Incentives for trip reduction might include preferential parking close to TODD for car-poolers.
- Dubrow:** I suggest that the construction of any parking facilities south of the rail should be contingent on TODD demonstrating improvement on their trip reduction plan.
- Layzer:** The trip reduction plan results are very difficult to measure and to predict. Carpooling is the major way for TODD to reduce parking. METRO usage on Harbor Island is never going to be high.
- Dubrow:** The use of incentives could bring TODD into compliance with trip reduction while allowing the Port to provide less parking than TODD seems to require. The Port could have pressure from the Commission and from the City to bring these plans into compliance. I see the pieces as one larger package.
- Layzer:** Perhaps there is the potential for a parking structure being a capital project.
- Burke:** If a parking structure was paid for, the Port would build it.
- Darwish:** Who would be responsible for monitoring the carpool parking.
- Layzer:** It is typically the employer's responsibility.
- Foley:** I appreciate the thorough presentation. What is the configuration of the pedestrian overpass?

- Burke:** It is the same design as before. It still needs to be ADA accessible.
- Dubrow:** We should not reward employers for non-compliance of current regulations.
- Sundberg:** Trip reduction must be part of TODD's parking plan. The City is not responsible for building TODD parking.
- Layzer:** There is a problem of historic use on the site for parking. I resent TODD putting the Port in between their labor and management.
- Darwish:** TODD needs encouragement to reduce parking needs.
- Hansmire:** TODD should make attempts to comply with the Trip Reduction act.
- Dubrow:** We should refuse parking inside the rail loop.
- Foley:** Is the port entering into negotiations with TODD?
- Burke:** We would now go to the City Council. I wouldn't underestimate the public benefit of thousands of jobs created by TODD. That could become a real political issue.
- Swift:** TODD should develop a trip reduction plan and reduce their parking needs as compensation for having parking provided.
- Layzer:** Long term use of Port and City property should be contingent on trip reduction by TODD.
- Foley:** Perhaps TODD should pay an annual lease for use of the ROWs. Increased parking equals a higher rate. This system would require less management and make parking a problem solved internally by TODD. Single occupancy vehicles could also have a higher rate.
- Blomberg:** What is wrong with phased implementation? There won't be a need for the pedestrian overpass for many years.
- Hansmire:** An increase in the number of TODD employees could also be a direct reason for increased parking. This would make more parking interconnected with more jobs, or public benefit.
- ACTION:** **The Commission supports the development of parking areas to the north of the railroad loop. The Commission could support parking areas within the rail loop contingent on TODD Shipyards Corporation's development of and compliance with a Trip-Reduction Program or on a significant increase in the number of employees at TODD. The Commission also recommends that employee carpool/vanpools receive priority parking nearest TODD's entrance.**

100297.3 Project: **WSCTC EXPANSION PROJECT**
Phase: Schematics

A Commission sub-committee reported to the full Commission on the Convention Center redesign progress which was presented at a meeting of the Convention Center Design Committee on October 1. This meeting was focused on the review of the redesign of the entry and galleria which was done in response to the direction given at the September 11 meeting. The sub-committee was enthusiastic about the redesign.

Discussion:

Swift: We have to figure out what we need to do in the context of the larger city review process, in terms of our documentation of our concerns and support, and our consideration of the design guidelines. That is still an open discussion.

Wagoner: It is also important to note that the meeting on September 11 was the catalyst that prompted this redesign and rethinking. It is a direct response to the comments and suggestions at that meeting and should therefore be assessed in terms of the minutes.

Swift: In the Design Committee meeting of October 1, the Convention Center commented that going into the September 11 meeting they were confident in the direction the design was going, but came out of the meeting with real concerns about their

direction. They then spent the weekend trying to figure out what to do. My opinion is that the relationship to the galleria, the entry to the building, and the way in which the tower starts to tie in is rather extraordinary.

Sundberg: The design team seems to have spent a lot of effort in responding to the requirements of the other developers in the project, and each time responding less to the Convention Center issues. They seem to have taken back some of the control on the project and have responded to some of the direct ideas in a way that was not literal to our suggestions, but is exciting. We wanted a better sense of public space, clearly identifiable as a public space. At the two subsequent design meetings, the subcommittee has generally supported the redesign efforts.

Swift: It was very clear to me at the last design committee meeting that the design team had developed a full understanding of elements at the intersection and how they worked together. This understanding resulted in peeling back the building and getting rid of the escalators. Having the same floor elevation in the entry and at the office tower elevators creates a sense of weaving the space together.

Sundberg: There is a very clear indoor/outdoor relationship. The stairs added inside the lobby create another place for people to sit and gather. They have also added another bay to the Pike Street Cover extending it towards Seventh Avenue. I think that this added bay is a real public benefit in that it creates an interesting space that is clearly in the public realm. There were some previous concerns regarding the office tower being too dominant. The current scheme seems to have dealt with those issues well. The new arrangement of the corner allows for a more clearly resolved tower/base connection. The lobby have a much stronger indoor/outdoor relationship and will be easier for people to move in and out of. I think it is a much more gracious scheme.

Dubrow: I was really thrilled to see the new scheme at the design committee meeting. To summarize the major changes to the Commission, I would say that the Pike Street facade has been pulled back at the entry, not only at the street level but also at the upper levels, is a huge gesture to the street and has a unifying effect spatially. There has also been a strong commitment to unifying the entry space and the office tower lobby. and the escalators have been moved inward to allow movement on the interior at upper levels. The first design seemed to have competing ideas. One was that the galleria was the focal point and the other was that there would be a major entry that started at the ground plane and went up several stories to become an identifiable sign that it is a public space. Now the design team has integrated these two concepts so that the actual structure of the galleria as it reaches down to the street and kicks back at the intersection is that entry. I think it is one of those wonderful design solutions where the building is expressing itself, not the signage. There are no tricks to it. I felt very happy that the two could come together as one solution. They say that the investment in the streetscape has been doubled. I think that should remain to be seen and that we can withhold judgment for a later date on that issue. There has been some questions previously about how publicly accessible the upper levels will be. That seems to be an open question which can be addressed as the design develops.

- Lyons:** By moving the escalators inward, a huge public space on each floor to the perimeter. They are still reserved about opening the upper floors to balconies. Possible uses of the space could be displaying current Convention Center events for view from the street.
- Sundberg:** They seemed a little reserved about using banners and similar things. I think that the space is strong enough to handle a little messy signage a few times throughout the year.
- Dubrow:** Birds could become a real problem in the galleria space.
- Swift:** There is no question that pigeons will love this place. Any attempts to prevent pigeons from using the space will be futile. Therefore, I think that it is just going to be a problem no matter what and that maintenance will have to deal with it somehow. Backing up, I want to say first that I think that this is an immensely elegant, simple, right solution. I was also afraid of it looking like a corporate place. The way that the Convention Center seems to be crawling out from under the tower is much more animated. It is much more place specific and less anonymous.
- Layzer:** The very narrow vertical corner element is a much more appropriate way to tie the office building to the street and the entrance. The previous design dedicated a lot of space to try and accomplish that architectural trick, while this scheme solves it.
- Swift:** The terminus of the galleria, in relation to the north side retail, could cause a real connection problem. I was impressed that the design team made the column element as strong as it could be. It would be unfortunate if the brilliance shown so far had to back off and allow a weaker termination element for the galleria. It needs a graceful and strong resolution.
- Lyons:** The design team felt they could carry that column with a truss in order to free up the street level space. Jim Ellis brought up the point that the north side of Pike Street could have shallow retail spaces similar to the south side. He also suggested looking at splaying the columns on the north side as well as the south side. Ellis seemed to really appreciate the Design Commission's relentless pursuit of clear public benefit which resulted in this design.
- Dubrow:** From a design perspective, I think it makes sense to bring that column clear to the ground. I also think the success of the south side is the asymmetry and would rather the two sides remain different.
- Swift:** If both sides are splayed, then the galleria would look like it had no support as the two sides were slipping away from each other.
- Sundberg:** If the last column extends to the ground, they believe that it will significantly block the major corner entrance to the billboard retail space.
- Dubrow:** It seems like a resolvable issue and I hope that we can keep the column in place.
- Wagoner:** Gerry Gerron has literally just returned to a total redesign and has not yet had time to look at the corner with the extended galleria. We should give him some time to figure out how the corner might be reworked.
- Swift:** I think at one time the signage for that space included a car crashing through the glass of the store. Now maybe the column can be impaling the car as it crashes through the front entry.
- Foley:** The design team should be free to explore other options, but I like the way this scheme works with the column expressed as an important component of the galleria

that weds it directly to the street. The Billboard entry needs no special signage and can be special in the way its architecture responds to, but doesn't touch, the column.

Sundberg: I fully support what they have done to the building, pulling it back, how the lobby works, the entry, the whole front. Those sort of basic issues have been well resolved and we want to encourage them to continue on that path. The materials are a real critical part of the sidewalk. If they have enough architecture going on, then a really nice paving, like 5th Avenue sidewalk, would be appropriate without a lot of gimmicks. Another topic for discussion is whether or not the tables and chairs have to be in a specific location.

Dubrow: I think that kind of issue will come out later in discussion of the sidewalk materials.

Sundberg: I think that it could be richer, simpler, and more elegant without the budget getting wasted on fussy, irrelevant details. I like the artist made building parts, especially the idea of an artist involvement on the exit door.

Darwish: I really like the entry scheme.

Foley: I really like the openness of the entry, the way it is pulled back, and its clear connection with the arch. The added bay to the galleria is really important. The possibility of upper level activity will greatly improve the entire space under the Pike Street cover.

Layzer: Can we review where the project is in the whole process? I think its important to consider in framing our response to the current design work.

Lampe: This project has two different investors. That is one issue. This redesign will require sitting down with those investors and renegotiating parts of their deals because things are changing. They are ready to do that, but don't want to do it until they get at least a signal that the building is moving in the right direction. The second thing issue is we need to be moving forward. The first step of the street vacations will begin taking place in the first quarter of 1998. These are the things that are driving the project now. We will need to report to City Council soon and it is important to know where we are in order to get that taken care of.

Dubrow: It sounds like we need to give Mark Hinshaw time to catch-up to the level of redesign seen here. The other sides of the street and building need to be developed.

Brannon: It needs all sides developed prior to a public presentation. It all needs to be at a level of development commensurate with the entry. The streetscape is very important in terms of public benefit.

Swift: This is the beginning of some integrated site solutions. The project has a difficult program with difficult concepts. The form of the public realm is an answer to the program, but the program needs to be applied to all levels of development. The changed shape means clearer zones at the street level. The three zone concept needs to be maintained. There really has to be the will to do this well.

Dubrow: I think one of the solutions is to take the established framework of materials, a sort of kit of parts, using artist made parts instead of generic parts in order to really make a special place at the street level. It doesn't have to be such a strong statement that it competes with the entry and galleria, but something with richness and character.

- Lampe:** I think that the streetscape designer might need to hear from the Commission that is may be all right to break the consistency of some of these street elements. Given the uniqueness of the entry and galleria, there may be room for innovation and creativity.
- Dubrow:** It may mean that having more voices on the street in terms of the range of design solutions might be helpful. The designer has so far done a good job of establishing the basic fabric that ties into the structural system of the galleria, but I think that the eccentric vision that is really needed now.
- Lyons:** Perhaps the designer, like the Convention Center design team was previously, is just so close to this design that he can't really see it.
- Swift:** Perhaps we could make a statement that the design team set the streetscape design aside and go back and re-evaluate the way the program interacts with the street and come out fresh with the degree of creativity that occurs at the entry.
- Lampe:** Are we just talking about just the south side of the street?
- Swift:** I think we are talking about both sides, the intersection, and all the streetscapes.
- Foley:** I would like for the design team to tell us what they are envisioning for the street uses and needs. Thinking about the program issues, what goes on in the space, will give it more richness than thinking about what the benches look like.
- Hansmire:** We keep talking about the streetscape plane, but this is not just about the street level, it is about the entire space. We need to look at the underside of the bridge and the way the whole thing integrates. I am fairly comfortable with the Convention Center side walls. I would like them to explain to us how it all works as a space, including the bridge treatment. It is the space that counts, not the individual elements.
- Dubrow:** That is all true, but we don't now have a clear sense of how simple or complex the treatments will be. I think we should debate those issues later when we have enough detail and enough attention has been given that we know how it is resolved. Regardless of which position we take on how the street should be treated, the Commission needs to recommend that they give that attention.
- Wagoner:** The whole underside development with the lighting and other things needs also to be brought into the context of the streetscape. The 8th Avenue tunnel should also be involved in the entire streetscape design.
- Darwish:** I would like to see some sort of information system at the intersection to explain events and activities.
- Sundberg:** This project will become a landmark space that people will be drawn to. It should have information on what is going on around the area for visitors to utilize. I think that the project has come a long way.
- Lampe:** We acknowledge that the design team has identified that they have further development to do, and we look forward to seeing it.
- Batra:** I think it is a unique and outstanding design that will attract people.
- Sundberg:** It is a real responsibility to take such a major public space, with high demands, and do something with real public benefit.
- ACTION:** **The Commission strongly recommends approval of the revised design of the entry, galleria, and office tower. The Commission looks forward to**

presentations of the other components of this project with the expectation that they can achieve the level of design excellence present in this redesign. The redesign of the entry, galleria, and office tower requires a redesign of the streetscape as well. The Commission recommends further development of the following issues:

- the overall street environment, including treatments and materials,
- building facades on the north side of Pike Street,
- the underside of both the pedestrian and the truck bridges,
- the wall and ceiling treatments in the Eighth Avenue tunnel, and
- involvement of artist throughout the streetscape design development.

The Commission prefers the strong termination of the galleria's NW end with a full column and, despite its perceived interference with the retail entrance, suggests that it is a major contribution to the galleria space. The Commission's opinion is that the success of the galleria space is strongly dependent on its asymmetry, coupled with a strong building edge on the north side.

100297.4

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Action Items

- A. INTRODUCTION OF REBECCA WALLS:
- B. MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 1997 : Approved as amended.
- MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1997: Approved as amended.

Discussion Items

- C. DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION, DEPARTMENT RESPONSE: Report by John Skelton, Document distribution.
- D. CENTRAL WATERFRONT REVIEW TEAM: Layzer reported.
- E. MUNICIPAL CAMPUS WORKING GROUP: Swift reported, draft document distributed.
- F. RETREAT DATE , OCTOBER 30, 1997: Commissioner discussion.

100297.5

Project: **PRINCETON BRIDGE**

Phase: Schematics

Presenters: Steve Ferkovich, Seattle Public Utilities
Pamela Miller, Seattle Public Utilities

Attendee: Zalmai Zahir, Seattle Public Utilities

Time: 45 min. (N/C)

This project is a complete replacement of the existing Princeton Bridge which was built during the 1940's. The bridge crosses the Burke-Gilman trail at Sandpoint Way and 55th Street, serving the Hawthorne Hills area. Funding is now in place to complete the design development and construction document processes. Seattle Public Utilities hopes to secure federal bridge replacement funding for the construction of the bridge. Three options for the project have been developed. The most expensive option keeps a similar structural configuration as the existing bridge, slab on support pillars, allowing for good openness and visibility under the bridge deck. A less expensive option would be constructed out of concrete units built up to create retaining walls for stabilized earth supporting the bridge deck and forming a narrower tunnel over the trail. This option allows the utilities to be buried under ground in the usual manner. The final, and most preferred option is a single span. This design would allow maximum openness and visibility under the bridge while being the least expensive and easiest to build. In this scheme the water and gas mains could be hidden within the structure due to its greater depth. The surrounding community wants the new bridge to maintain the character of the existing bridge, primarily the railing and light details at the road level. The road connection at the north end of the bridge will be adjusted to allow for easier transit turning and access. One side of the bridge will have an eight foot sidewalk. A tested guardrail has been proposed that attempts to match the existing rail in character while providing the required impact strength.

Discussion:

- Layzer:** Would it be federally funded through the bridge program?
- Ferkovich:** That is one of the possibilities. We will also apply for Public Works Trust Fund money.
- Layzer:** From my understanding, with bridge replacement, cost is not as much of a factor.
- Dubrow:** What is the existing connection between the viewing platform and the single span bridge scheme? What anti-graffiti measure will you be taking to protect the bridge?
- Ferkovich:** The viewing platform and the bridge are not connected. There is approximately 20 to 30 feet between them.
- Foley:** How did you determine which side of the bridge to locate the eight foot sidewalk on?
- Ferkovich:** That is the existing sidewalk location.
- Batra:** How would people access the Burke-Gilman trail from the proposed bridge structure?
- Ferkovich:** There is an existing set of wooden stairs between the viewing platform and the bridge that allows access to the trail below.
- Hansmire:** I strongly encourage that you match the railing as well as possible. The abutments in the railing with light poles should also be replicated as well as possible. If you light the area under the bridge, I think it should be up-lighting bounced off the ceiling instead of down-lighting.
- Ferkovich:** We haven't really developed the lighting requirements for the project yet, but will probably install similar lighting to what is there now.
- Miller:** There are also many finishing treatment options. We will be going back to the community for comments and suggestions.
- Foley:** Is it possible to tuck in the outer girders further from the edge, increasing the deck overhang? It would be a less accessible graffiti surface and would diminish the apparent size of the structure.
- Ferkovich:** The placement of the outer girders could probably be adjusted.

- Layzer:** What would be the surface treatment on the exterior of the girders.
- Ferkovich:** The web portion could have a form treatment, and possibly a pigment added to the concrete.
- Dubrow:** I wonder if the public is really asking for a moldy green color on this bridge. I recommend that you get public feedback regarding the color choices.
- Swift:** I appreciate your efforts to match what is now a lovely street environment. When you endeavor to replicate, as you are, take care in mixing textures. I think that the bumpy form panel treatment may actually be in contrast with the railing, which is the more important element. They are very different conditions.
- Miller:** We will be going back to the Hawthorne Hills community with revisions and the Commission's comments and suggestions.
- Layzer:** There is nothing elegant about the underside of the existing bridge. The surface of the bridge is really charming set within its pastoral setting. The new scheme seems to improve the bridge from the trail perspective.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the schematic design as presented. The Commission commends the attempts to keep the historical character of the bridge and to get community input. The Commission suggests that the outer girders be moved toward the bridge center, increasing the deck cantilever. The Commission also recommends further exploration of color options, particularly darkening tones, as well as lighting options, both above and below the bridge.**

100297.6 Project: **HALLER LAKE MAINTENANCE FACILITY**
 Phase: Building Design
 Presenters: Zalmai Zahir, Seattle Public Utilities
 Attendees: Steve Ferkovich, Seattle Public Utilities
 Pamela Miller, Seattle Public Utilities
 Time: 10 min. (.3%)

This project was presented in conjunction with the previous presentation. The project is the third and final side of a horseshoe shaped building existing in the Haller Lake Maintenance Facility. It is 30 feet wide, 20 feet high, and has three 25 foot structural bays, each with two truck doors. The roof has a one-in-twelve slope toward the back of the structure, away from the center of the "U" shape. The exterior treatments will match the existing building.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the addition as presented.**

100297.7 Project: **SEATTLE CENTER BROAD STREET IMPROVEMENTS**
 Phase: Schematics
 Presenters: Dave Buchan, Seattle Center
 Tom Berger, The Berger Partnership
 Jerry Ernst, consultant
 Jeff Benesi, Hewitt Isley
 Attendee: Russ Goodman, Space Needle Corporation
 Time: 45 min. (hourly)

A reconfiguration of the Broad Street green at Seattle Center is proposed to provide better access to the Space Needle, and other attractions in that quadrant of the center. A circular plaza aligned with John Street is proposed that would provide both vehicular and pedestrian access. The plaza would have no curb, instead the vehicular route would be outlined by bollards. During festivals, the turnaround plaza would be closed to cars. Informal paths will lead from the turnaround plaza to the Pacific Science Center and the Fun Forest. The reconfiguration of the Broad Street green will reduce the present amount of hard surface by 7%. Service access to the Space Needle will be provided by a depressed road off Thomas Street.

Discussion:

- Dubrow:** How will the turnaround function the 357 days of the year which will not have festival uses?
- Berger:** It will primarily function as pedestrian and vehicular access to the Space Needle and Seattle Center as well as a load/unload area and valet parking for the Needle.
- Dubrow:** I thought that the Commission had asked for the development of possible load/unload access adjacent to Broad Street instead of the turn-around.
- Buchan:** Part of the Master Plan had a continuous frontage road all along Broad Street.
- Swift:** At previous Commission meetings there was rather healthy discussion about the scale of the turn-around in relationship to the various functions. At that time a request was made that you look at some kind of way to meet the load/unload for the Space Needle at the street without penetrating the site.
- Dubrow:** I remember that the Commission requested that the penetration of cars be limited somehow in order to develop a primarily pedestrian entrance.
- Buchan:** We are legally mandated to provide pedestrian access to the perimeter of the Space Needle. That is why the current turn-around was developed. Having a frontage drop-off along Broad Street would not be in keeping with the mandate.
- Dubrow:** Is it legally mandated that you have valet parking at the perimeter of the Needle?
- Buchan:** Yes it is.
- Dubrow:** The Commission should get a copy of the resolution to see what kind of limitations it puts on this project legally.
- Swift:** At the previous presentation there we had a difficult time understanding the program for this project. I think there is still a lingering question tied to the valet component with such a major load/unload condition in front of the Space Needle and what is called a Broad Street green.
- Dubrow:** In addition to that there are conflicting uses with a grand pedestrian entry and a vehicular drop-off. These are incompatible uses for 357 days of the year.
- Swift:** Is the street south of the Center House still the major east/west circulation spine for service?
- Buchan:** It is, but there is a significant difference. The major difference is the collective width of Thomas Street currently creates a very broad asphalt band. Our desire has been to reinforce the pedestrian character and scale of that Thomas Street edge while still allowing service traffic access. The Center currently allows west to east circulation on Thomas Street primarily in the morning hours which allows more of a pedestrian character in the afternoon and evening when activity increases.

Eliminating this broad expanse of asphalt would create much more of a pedestrian character and feel. That has been our objective and that is what this plan attempts to create.

Ernst: There is also the desire to clean up some of the visual clutter around the EMP site with green space and plantings.

Dubrow: I would suggest, echoing Layzer's comment, moving the bus stop further west along Broad Street and simply make the vehicular drop-off further up and keep them at the street. That seems a more sensible use of the space if one of your goals is to create a strong pedestrian entrance. The valet parking is really uncalled for there in terms of the costs and the benefits.

Swift: When I look at this and sort of take away my focus on the circular target, there are some nice things happening in terms of the organization of the spaces around it which I think are good. Two things bother me about the bullseye turn-around. The first thing is that, much of the paved area elsewhere is under a vegetative canopy, so that your sense of the paved condition is not as bleak and hot as that of the turn-around bullseye. The other concern I have comes back to the issue that the larger campus of Seattle Center is incrementally taking its green spaces away to meet the broad array of service and activities you have to meet. It concerns me that the Broad Street Green is going to have this very lovely design but with a very large paved area right in the middle of it which is functioning more as a load/unload space for the Space Needle than as a plaza area. These are the underlying problems I have with the proposal.

Berger: Right now the perceived edge is very close and we propose almost doubling the ability to work into the campus. We are significantly changing the character of Thomas Street, currently not well defined. We have set up a green edge for the EMP project creating a strong foreground. We have tried to tie the existing green spaces together giving more pedestrian continuity. Part of the program we were given and one of the reasons the turn-around has evolved into a graphic was to make it a plaza first, and secondarily to make it function for a mandated use that goes along with the legal agreement between Seattle Center and the Space Needle. ADA and valet accessibility to the base of the Space Needle are mandated functions which have to occur at the perimeter of the Needle. The proposal also serves significantly as a front door for the Seattle Center. The Space Needle is a visual guide to the Center and this plaza space will allow easy access to both. I think we have restored green space to the Center not removed it.

Hansmire: This really works as a drop-off for all of the Seattle Center, not just the Space Needle, so it will be very busy. I assume that access along the edge of Broad Street makes it difficult for valet service to function.

Berger: There are many traffic considerations, not limited to valet service. East bound traffic on Broad Street would have to continue past the Center campus, turn around, and enter from the west bound direction.

Hansmire: Part of the problem with the turn-around is the graphic target shape. I know people won't view it from the sky but it still looks auto dominant. It should be clear that the vehicles are in a pedestrian dominant space, not that pedestrians are in a vehicle

dominant space. More modulation of the layout might make a simpler pedestrian definition.

Foley: I am also concerned about the conflict of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. I think it would be an attractive place to drop people off. If it is meant to be a primary pedestrian access, the level of vehicular activity will greatly reduce the pedestrian character of the space. Having the drop-off service out near the curb seems to be a way of resolving the conflict. Was that ever studied in plan form or was it dismissed as an unlivable option.

Berger: There were many circumstances that were a part of that process. One of them was how people will follow the visual icon of the Center, the Space Needle. The concern about how we handle circulation on and off Broad Street was very important. The major issue was how we served pedestrian access from the surrounding area and how we accessed the greater Seattle Center, not just the Space Needle. All the things that you have said singularly, are very important. Collectively, we have had to reach a balance that serves the Center, the Space Needle, improves the Broad Street green, and then creates something that might otherwise just be a vehicular dominated space into a plaza area. The plaza, since it is concave, will not read as a large platform. We have the ability to plant the center area, or put a water feature at the center point, but thought it would be better used as a stage.

Sundberg: What are the materials?

Berger: I wanted to avoid making it a self-conscious element. It will primarily be cast-in-place concrete, coloring agents, and patterning.

Hansmire: It is difficult to separate the pedestrian and vehicular areas. It seems that only about half of the paving is vehicular zone which feels better to me.

Sundberg: Perhaps pedestrian materials need more clarity.

Berger: We have tried to have patterns correspond to the different uses. Bollards around the perimeter will help define an edge without precluding pedestrian use of the circle.

Foley: I don't really have a problem with the extension of the pavement, and the lack of differentiation. I think if you assume that this is the best concept, then the resolution is fine. I haven't understood the issues well enough to accept that this is the best concept. I don't understand why this is so much better than the alternative of keeping the cars at the perimeter?

Dubrow: I feel the same way. I also feel some disappointment at not seeing a developed alternative for drop-off at the street, because this has a significant impact on the green. In weighing the costs with the benefits, I am not yet convinced that this alternative is in the public's best interest. It is therefore hard to lend my support to this proposal.

Batra: It looks more like a load and unload zone than a pedestrian zone to me. I know that I would use it as such. It is not a public benefit to the people of Seattle to have a lot of cars in there dropping off people and calling it a pedestrian plaza. I would like to see the agreement, or mandate, with the Needle and the Center.

Hansmire: On one side I agree. On the other side, if it's highly used because it is really needed, then I think it is a good clear pedestrian drop-off area.

Foley: I would like to be able to enthusiastically support any proposal that deals with a symbolic main entry to Seattle Center and the Space Needle. When I saw the addition to the base of the Needle, I it made a lot of sense. Philosophically I would like to be excited about what you are doing, but at this point I don't. I don't understand why this is better than the alternative of keeping the cars farther away.

Hansmire: I can understand the functional problems with limited traffic accessibility. I just wonder if that is reason enough for having to pull so far inside the green space.

ACTION: **The Commission is not convinced of the need for the proposed turn-around/plaza. The needs and reasons for the proposed turn around were not well enough presented or articulated with alternatives. The design proposal is not a pedestrian entryway as proposed but rather an auto oriented drop off zone. The Commission urges that the design team re-examine and present an evaluation of the alternative drop-off locations.**

100297.8	Project: WELLER STREET BRIDGE
	Phase: Schematics
	Presenters: Joe Beck, King County Department of Transportation Ron Posthuma, King County Department of Transportation
	Time: 45 min. (N/C)

The Weller Street walkway project crosses the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks at south Weller Street, from the Fourth Avenue south viaduct to the north Kingdome lot. The project will be completed as soon as possible, no later than the end of 1998. Design issues include whether or not the walk should be covered, screened, and if it should be a steel or concrete truss system. In the future, access to commuter rail platforms below will be an issue involving the RTA and BNSF. This project has been selected by the Department of Transportation to have an artist working with the design team.

Discussion:

Hansmire: I have some initial comments that should ultimately be decided by the selected designer. I think that the steel enclosures might fit the railroad context best and that the use of steel mesh would be better than glazing. I also think that an open handrail would be better than a solid one.

Dubrow: How will an artist be involved in this project and at what point would they become involved?

Beck: This job has been selected to have an artist assigned to it. That is about all we know for sure. We are planning to have selected an artist by November, so they would be involved relatively early.

Dubrow: I would do some thinking about what the artist's role will be.

Hansmire: The earlier the artist gets involved the better. You might also want to ask during the design applicant interviews how the firm feels about working with an artist. The designer/ artist communication will be important.

Posthuma: Hopefully we will have them both on board within a couple weeks of each other.

Dubrow: You might also want to allow some room in the budget for designers to work with the artist. It would make the whole thing go more smoothly.

Posthuma: Communication between the two will be important.

Dubrow: Do you want an artist who makes building parts, who is an overall conceptual artist, or who applies art to the design.

Posthuma: Should the bridge be covered or uncovered?

Hansmire: Since you will probably be required to provide screening of some sort to prevent debris being thrown onto the tracks, I prefer the actual roof, as opposed to the continuous mesh ceiling and walls.

Posthuma: Since this bridge doesn't cross a city street it is not considered a skybridge by the code.

Sundberg: This project has incredible neighborhood support. I would check out the code requirements to make absolute sure this is not considered a skybridge.

ACTION: The Commission appreciates the early presentation and request for advice in proceeding with the project. The Commission looks forward to further presentations of the project's development and asks that the artist be included in the next presentation.